



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/021,291 | 10/22/2001 | Mark Lucovsky | 3110 | 9349 |

22971 7590 09/05/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WONG, LESLIE

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2164

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,291

Applicant(s)

LUCOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/22/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 19 June 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Gershman et al.** ('Gershman' hereinafter) (US 6401085 B1).

Regarding claim 1, **Gershman** teaches in a computer network, a computer-implemented method comprising,

a). **'providing a profile schema, the profile schema having profile-related fields arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields'** as customer profile database contains personal information (i.e., profile schema) about the customer such as name, address, SSN, and personal preferences etc... and retrieving user-centric content such as email items, contact items, and news items to add to a web page (i.e., content document) (col. 40, lines 10-14; col. 40, line 55 – col. 41, line 7);

b). **'receiving a data access request directed to profile information, the request including associated identify information'** as client or web browser makes a request to the web server, the servers gets the layout and content preferences for that particular user with the unique user id stored in the client and user profile database. The server then retrieves the relevant user-centric content such as calendar, email, contact list, and tasks list items (col. 40, lines 36-43; col. 39, lines 55-57; lines 27-44); and

c). **'in response to the data access request, manipulating at least one set of data in a logical profile document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document of profile information'** as when the user requests a product report for product X (i.e., content document), the algorithm retrieves the profiles from the profile database (i.e., logical profile document), and return the result to the user according to the profile matching algorithm. The profile gateway server receives all requests for profile information, whether from the user himself or merchants trying to provide a service to the user. The

profile gateway server is responsible for ensuring that information is only given out when the profile owner specifically grants permission (col. 40, lines 55-54; col. 43, lines 10-43; col. 43, line 61 – col. 44, line 2).

Regarding claim 2, **Gershman** further teaches wherein **‘manipulating at least one set of data comprises reading data from at least one field in the logical profile document’** as the relevant user-centric content such as calendar, email, contact, list and task list items are *retrieved* (i.e., read) (col. 40, lines 42-46).

Regarding claim 3, **Gershman** further teaches wherein **‘manipulating at least one set of data comprises writing data to at least one field in the logical profile document’** as user’s personal information that is *stored* (i.e., write) in a central profile database (col. 39, lines 29-31).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, **Gershman** further teaches a computer network, a computer-implemented method and a computer-readable medium comprising,

a). **‘receiving a request to retrieve profile data, the request including associated identify information’** as client or web browser makes a request to the web server, the servers gets the layout and content preferences for that particular user with the unique user id stored in the client and user profile database (col. 40, lines 36-43; col. 39, lines 55-57; lines 27-44);

b). **‘reading from a data store to obtain profile data based on the associated identity information’** as the relevant user-centric content such as calendar, email, contact, list and task list items are *retrieved* (i.e., read) (col. 40, lines 42-46);

c). **‘constructing a profile document including at least part of the data, the document arranged according to a defined schema for profile data’** as a second persona (i.e., profile document) designated to store the user’s work address and may indicate that the user prefers certain vendors or works for a certain company that has a discount program in place (col. 41, lines 6-50); and

d). **‘returning the document in response to the request’** as the web page is returned to the client and displayed to the user (col. 40, lines 51-54).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, **Gershman** further teaches wherein **‘the schema includes at least one defined field for extending the schema’** as subclassing and inheritance in Object-Oriented Program (OOP) make it possible to extend and modify objects through deriving new kinds of objects from the standard classes available in the system. It should be apparent to the reader that via OOP, the developer can specify the desired field in the schema to be extended (col. 7, lines 20-24; col. 50, lines 45-52).

Regarding claim 6, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a name (Fig 13. element 1340).

Regarding claim 7, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to member information (Fig 13, element 1340).

Regarding claim 10, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a special date (col. 46, lines 35-40).

Regarding claim 11, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a user reference (col. 42, lines 32-34).

Regarding claim 12, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a picture (col. 68, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 13, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a gender (Fig. 21, element 2180 – gender (male, female)).

Regarding claim 14, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to an identification number (col. 40, lines 39-42).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to work information (Fig. 12, elements 1220 and 1250).

Regarding claim 17, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to an email address (Fig. 12, element 1220 (email work)).

Regarding claim 18, **Gershman** further teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a telephone number (Fig. 12, elements 1220 and 1250).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gershman et al.** ('Gershman' hereinafter) U.S. Patent (6,401,0085) as applied to claims 1-7 and 10-20 in view of **Horowitz et al.** ("**Horowitz**") (U.S. Patent 6,349,290 B1).

Regarding claim 8, **Gershman** does not explicitly teach wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a language preference.

Horowitz, however, teaches the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a language preference (col. 34, lines 20-23);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Horowitz's** teaching would have allowed **Gershman's** to provide personalization of properties via direct customer intervention such as the customer 2 customizing an IVR or web page as suggested by **Horowitz** at col. 34, lines 33-35.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gershman et al.** ('Gershman' hereinafter) U.S. Patent (6,401,0085) as applied to claims 1-7 and 10-20 in view of **Conmy et al.** ("**Conmy**") (U.S. Patent 6101480 A).

Regarding claim 9, **Gershman** does not explicitly teach wherein the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a time zone preference.

Conmy, however, teaches the schema includes at least one defined field comprising data corresponding to a time zone preference (col. 3, lines 62 and col. 6, lines 1-14);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Conmy's** teaching would have allowed **Gershman's** to provide personalization of properties and ensure the availability for a particular user in order to coordinate a desired event as suggested by **Conmy** (col. 3, lines 27-30).

Response to Argument

7. Applicant's arguments filed 19 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Gershman does not disclose or anticipate the user of a profile-based schema and that Gershman reference does not stand for element (1) of claim 1 and specifically, these excerpts do not teach this element.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Gershman teaches the limitation "...the profile schema having profile-related fields arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields" as customer

Art Unit: 2164

profile database contains personal information (i.e., profile schema) about the customer such as name, address, SSN, and personal preferences etc... and retrieving user-centric content such as email items, contact items, and news items to add to a web page (i.e., content document) (col. 40, lines 10-14; col. 40, line 55 – col. 41, line 7). Gershman further teaches methods for accessing the centrally stored profile. The profile database is the central storage place for the user's profile information. The profile gateway server receives all requests for profile information, whether from the user himself or merchants trying to provide a service to the user. The profile gateway server is responsible for ensuring that information is only given out when the profile owner specifically grants permission (col. 43, line 61 – col. 44, line 2). Hence, Gershman teaches a profile schema arranged into a content document with defined structures for the fields because the system of Gershman accesses the user profile database to layout preferences defined in the user profile and format the web page according to the preferences in the profile then returned to the client and displayed to the user (col. 40, lines 47-54 and col. 44, lines 59-64).

Applicants further argue that the term "parsing" implies that the content is not arranged according to a schema. If the content were arranged according to a schema, then parsing the content wouldn't be necessary since each item of data would be in a known location which could be directly accessed.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Applicants' assertion can not be accepted if it is unsupported by a valid evidence.

Applicants further argue that nowhere in Gershman is there disclosed a logical profile document with each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document of profile information.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Gershman teaches the limitation “a logical profile document with each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document of profile information” as the user content preferences (i.e., logical profile) stored as part of the user profile in the User profile database to filter the content that is returned. The content that is returned is then formatted into a web page (i.e., logical profile... correspond to a field in the content...) according to the layout preferences defined in the user profile. The web page is then returned to the client and displayed to the user (col. 40, lines 47-54).

Finally, Applicants argue that Gershman's teaching of content retrieved from the web that is filtered using profile records and arranged in a web page, not a logical profile document and that arranging product statistics in a web document for providing a consumer report about a product, not a logical profile document with each set of data in the logical profile document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that, in another embodiment of Gershman, the prior art teaches “constructing a profile document including at least part of the data” as the profile describes the user and his

Art Unit: 2164

account information. Attached to each user are multiple Personas. These Personas are used to group multiple profiles into useful context (col. 41, lines 25-30). Profiles contain detailed personal information in Profile Field record (i.e., arranged ... defined schema...). Attached to each Profile are sets of Profile Restriction records. These each contain a Name and a Rule, which defined the restriction. Each Profile Field also contains a set of Permissions dictate who has what access rights to that particular Profile Fields' information (col. 41, lines 57 – col. 42, line 3). The user accesses a Web Browser and requests product and pricing information from the integrator. The product and pricing information is then formatted into a Web Page and returned to the customer's Web Browser based on the user's preferences and personal information. Likewise, merchant will be able to access to their consumer profiles (given permission from the consumer who owns each profile (col. 44, lines 11-13))(i.e., returning the document...). The Applicants argue that the profile schemas of their invention are arranged as XML documents, and the services provide method that control access to the data based on the requesting user's identification, defined role and scope for that role. Users can direct the Profile service to publish information to one or more subscribers in order to view profile data. The Profile owner chooses what information may publish to each subscriber role. For example, an owner of personal profile data may typically have read/write access to his or her own profile data, and can provide various types of access to the profile data to other users based on their IDs.

Based the above reasons, Examiner submits that Gershman's teaching of the user's profile is in conformity with the Applicants' invention. Hence, Gershman teaches the limitations as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHARLES RONES can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/021,291
Art Unit: 2164

Page 14

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leslie Wong', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2164

LW
August 28, 2006